

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

OFFICE: Bakersfield Field Office, LLCAC06000

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-CA-CO60-2016-0031-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: CAS019343 & CAS019571

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Three Sundry Notices of Intent to plug and abandon
Wells: MURVALE-TIDEWATER 542-26B,
32X-26B, 522-8D

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T31S; R23E; Section 26 &
T32S; R24E; Section 8D

APPLICANT (if any):

Vintage
9600 Ming Ave. STE. 300
Bakersfield, CA 93311

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

Vintage, the Operator/Lessees (CAS019343 & CAS019571) submitted three Sundry notices that propose to plug and abandon 3 wells: MURVALE-TIDEWATER 542-26B, 32X-26B, 522-8D. These wells are located in the Buena Vista Hills Oilfield. There will be no new habitat disturbance expected or approved.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name* Bakersfield Resource Management Plan Date Approved 12/23/2014

The proposed action is in conformance with the Bakersfield Resource Management Plan approved 12/23/2014 because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

“Facilitate reasonable, economical, and environmentally sound exploration and development of leasable minerals while minimizing impacts to resources.”

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action

Bakersfield Field Office completed a Programmatic Environmental Analysis of Oil Well Abandonments, EA #CA160-03-021. The document was reviewed and signed by the authorizing officer on March 13, 2003 verifying that proper consideration has been given to all resource values and that this assessment is technically adequate. This document verifies that all actions conform to the applicable land use plan.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

The proposed action to abandon wells was analyzed in the existing NEPA document.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

The range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document is appropriate with respect to the new proposed action.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, and updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Scoping was initiated internally with the Bakersfield Field Office staff. As required, a BLM Onsite Inspection was completed on January 14, 2016 by Dave Faires, Natural Resource Specialist. A cultural resources inventory had been previously conducted for all locations that could be affected by the proposed project (BLM Cultural Resource Inventory Report # CA-160-C/V-770) and no cultural resources were present in the area of potential effect. As a result, there is no new information that would substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action and the 2003 EA adequately addresses the impacts that are anticipated to result from the proposed action.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

The direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that will result from this proposed action are consistent with those analyzed in the EA.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

A copy of the 2003 EA is available upon request.

E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

Gabe Garcia, Field Manager

Dave Faires – Nat. Resource Spec.

Tamara Whitley, Archaeologist

Denis Kearns, BLM Botanist

Silvet Holcomb, Petroleum Engineer

F. Additional Conditions of Approval

It was determined that in the process on implementing this project the following Conditions of Approval (COA) will be followed in the abandonment:

1. Standard Stipulations

2. Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources are discovered during the course of project activities, all work at the location of the discovery, and in any other areas where potential impacts to the discovery may occur, must cease. The BLM Bakersfield Field Office Archaeologist and Field Manager (661-391-6000) must be notified immediately in order to develop and implement appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures.

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

<u>/s/ Dave Faires</u>	<u>2/10/16</u>
Signature of Project Lead	Date

<u>/s/ John Hodge</u>	<u>2/17/16</u>
Signature of the Responsible Official:	Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.